Sectt. II-27—45,004—14-11-29.

Law (Edn.) (1930) Department.

MS. SERIES.

G.O. No. 1147

DATED 11-6-1930

[Despatch Abstract.]

Grant

Building - construction of an additional block for the St. Agnes High School, Mangalore - Revised estimate - included in the list of approved works.

****

Education DEPARTMENT.

Received ..... 19 . *Registered* ..... 19 .

Subject.

St. Agnes High school, Mangalore building.

ENCLOSURES.
No .....
.....
Spare copies.....

No. 459 E/26

Station Madras, *Dated the* 17th May 1930

From (Name) W.E. Smith, Esq., M.A.,
(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras.
Law and Education Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to invite your attention to G.O. No. 1191 Law (Education) dated 10th June 1929 approving a scheme for the construction of an additional block of building for the St. Agnes High school. Mangalore. This building as approved by Government runs from North to South and the correspondent now wants to change its orientation as shown in red lines in the enclosed site plan. Due to increase in strength of the school, since the date of approval of the original plans, the correspondent has also made provision for two additional rooms in the present proposal. The plans and estimates were referred to the Chief Engineer and he has approved the orientation and has

P3 mfm

the revised scheme at a cost of Rs.44,420/- (vide copy of his letter No. 4232 Wks/29 C.R. dated 31st August 1929 herewith enclosed)

I have the honour, therefore, to recommend that the scheme may be placed in the approved list at an enhanced cost of Rs.44,420/- so as to make it eligible for a half grant not exceeding Rs.22,210/- if and when funds become available provided the conditions of the Grant-in-aid Code are duly complied with.

The revised plans and estimates are herewith enclosed.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

for Director of Public Instruction

ARR

P.V.S. 20/5

3

Letter from the Chief Engineer, P.E.D. Buildings and Roads

No. 4232 Wks 29 C.R. dated 31st August 1929.

With reference to your letter quoted above, I have the to state that the change in the orientation of the building is suitable and is approved.

The cost of the extra accommodation provided for in the revised plan works out to approximately Rs.11.620/- The revised scheme is therefore recommended for sanction for Rs.44,420 on the whole

Original sanction	32,800
Extra cost	11,620
	44,420

(True Copy)

Van

To the Director of Public Instruction

Dpd. by S. [illegible]

(With reference to his letter No. 459E/24 dated 17.5.38
(with plans and ~~with~~ estimate).

Apps. [illegible]

Date

Accountant-General.

Ought not the Govt. Architect to be consulted?

This is an important building AS

2/6.

Please see D.I. on this

point of view

PTO

AS

7/6

D.S's query vide ante

The present practice of (obtaining the advice of) the consulting Arch
in regard to old works originally in 1921 with reference to para 4
of G.I.G.S. Gen. D. 12.02.21 which la
down that the existing work c
nected with all plans & estimat
which did not conform to the
standard d served
as well as those for works esti
mated to cost more than Rs. (50,0
should be undertaken by a
special ed. branch in the off
of the Chief Engineer. This spe
cial branch is under the con
sulting Architect. Prior to 192
the practice was (1) for the D.P.I.
to obtain the advice of the Supe
intending Engineers in the case
of works costing between Rs. 5,0
and Rs. 50,000 and (2) for the
Govt. to consult the Chief Engin
in the case of works estimated
to cost more than Rs. 50 000.
The change introduced in 1921
was intended to relieve S.E's an

the Chief Engineer of the work scrutinising plans and estimates for grant-in-aid works

2. It will be observed that the original plans and estimates connected with the work now in question were scrutinised by the Consulting Architect - vide pp. 3-4 of pf. 1191 Edl. of 10.6.29. The D.P.I. consulted the Chief Engineer about the revised plans and estimates apparently because they involved a change in the orientation of the buildings and the Director considered the case to be sufficiently ~~is considerable to justify~~ important ~~for obtaining~~ to obtain the expert opinion of the Chief Engineer. The latter would probably have consulted the Consulting Architect in the matter. As the Consulting Architect is an officer subordinate to the Chief Engineer and as the C.E's opinion is the highest technical advice available, no further reference to the Consulting Architect seems necessary.

The draft order on p. 1 ante is submitted for approval.

16.6.30